



**The Comptroller General  
of the United States**

Washington, D.C. 20548

## **Decision**

**Matter of:** Management Training Systems--Reconsideration

**File:** B-238555.3

**Date:** September 17, 1990

Pauline M. Wehner for the protester.  
Anne B. Perry, Esq., and John F. Mitchell, Esq., Office of  
the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of  
the decision.

### **DIGEST**

Request for reconsideration of prior decision is denied  
where protester essentially reiterates contentions raised  
and considered in our prior decision and fails to show any  
error of fact or law that would warrant reversal or  
modification of prior decision.

### **DECISION**

Management Training Systems (MTS) requests reconsideration  
of our decision Management Training Sys., B-238555.2,  
July 17, 1990, 90-2 CPD ¶ \_\_\_, wherein we denied MTS's  
protest that the rejection of its proposal as technically  
unacceptable was reasonable under request for proposals  
(RFP) No. F33600-89-R-0381, issued by the Department of the  
Air Force for the teaching of three supervisory and  
management training courses.

We deny the request for reconsideration.


In its protest, MTS challenged the rejection of its proposal  
on the grounds that the contracting activity applied more  
stringent and specific criteria than were set forth in the  
solicitation. We concluded that the agency evaluated MTS'  
proposal in accordance with the evaluation criteria as  
revealed in the RFP and did not improperly apply hidden  
criteria. Our review of MTS' proposal revealed that the  
proposal contained only general statements that it met the  
requirements of the solicitation, which we held was an  
inadequate substitute for the detailed and complete  
information necessary to establish that what the firm  
proposes will meet the agency's minimum needs.

049473/14 2232

In its request for reconsideration, MTS essentially disagrees with our conclusion that its proposal amounted to a blanket offer of compliance and asserts that we misinterpreted its protest. For example, MTS contends that our decision erred in classifying its challenge against the evaluation as one alleging that the agency applied "undisclosed criteria" to its proposal. MTS argues that the agency did not apply undisclosed criteria, but rather that it applied undisclosed "specifics to the criteria." There is no functional difference between the term "criteria" or the phrase "specifics to the criteria" in this context and therefore our categorization constitutes neither a factual nor a legal error. We similarly find no merit to MTS' other assertions of mischaracterization.

Other than alleging mischaracterization, MTS' reconsideration request merely repeats each contention it previously raised. We considered each issue raised by MTS, and its mere disagreement with our previous decision and reassertion of its prior position does not constitute evidence of factual or legal errors in our decision which would warrant reconsidering this matter. Roth Bros., Inc.--Recon., B-235539.2, Sept. 15, 1989, 89-2 CPD ¶ 233.

The request for reconsideration is denied.

*for*   
James F. Hinchman  
General Counsel